



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/683,544

10/10/2003

Anatoliy Panasyuk

2006579-0428 (CTX-082)

2638

48329 7590 05/11/2011

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
111 HUNTINGTON AVENUE
26TH FLOOR
BOSTON, MA 02199-7610

EXAMINER

CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2453

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/11/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/683,544	PANASYUK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AZIZUL CHOUDHURY	2453	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 February 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 23-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 23-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/23/2011</u> . | 6) ☐ Other: _____ |

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on February 23, 2011.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 24-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baker et al (US Patent No: 5,696,898) in view of Majkut et al (US Patent No: 7,243,138) and in further view of Araujo et al (US Patent No: 6,920,502), hereafter referred to as Baker and Majkut and Araujo, respectively.

1. With regards to claims 24 and 34, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, a method of enrolling networked resources via an enrollment system communicating with an enrollment administration system permitting enrollment based on enrollment rules stored in an enrollment database, the method comprising: receiving, by an enrollment administration system executing on a computing machine, a request from an enrollment system communicating with the enrollment administration system, to enroll a networked resource for a user, the request comprising at least an identification of the user and an identification of the networked resource,

(Baker teaches a proxy server (enrollment administration system executing on a computing machine) receiving a user request in the form of a URL; see column 3, lines 38-40, Baker. The proxy server determines the user identity and requested resource from the URL; see column 3, lines 45-56, Baker) the networked resource comprising one of: a desktop and an application program *(see Araujo below)*; identifying, by the enrollment administration system, one of a plurality of enrollment rules stored in an enrollment database, each rule, identifying a group of users permitted to enroll a networked resource, the identified rule identifying a group of users comprising at least the user *(Baker teaches the proxy server then referencing a relational database (enrollment database) to determine allowable resources for the user; see column 3, line 56 – column 4, line 6, Baker. See Majkut below for user groups)*; enrolling, by the enrollment administration system, the networked resource for the user responsive to (i) authenticating the identity of the user and (ii) determining, based on the identified rule, that the user has permission to enroll and use the networked resource, the enrollment allowing a user to later access the networked resource from a remote client as if the enrolled networked resource locally resides on the client *(see column 4, lines 11-15, Baker)*; providing, responsive to the enrollment, a remote access system to the user to later access the networked resource from the remote client *(see Araujo below)*; adding, by the enrollment administration system responsive to the enrollment, an enrollment record of the networked resource for the user to an

enrollment database (*see Araujo below*); requesting, by the user via the remote access system, remote access to the networked resource; verifying, by the remote access system, the identity of the user responsive to the request; determining, by the remote access system in communication with the enrollment database, that the user was previously enrolled in the requested network resource (*see Araujo below*); and granting the user access to the networked resource responsive to the verification and determination (*Baker teaches permitting the user URL request to be forwarded to the resource upon being deemed allowable; see column 4, lines 11-16, Baker*)

While Baker teaches the access control of resources, Baker does not explicitly cite the use of an enrollment system that forwards the user request to the enrollment administration system (Baker's proxy server). In the same field of endeavor, Majkut also teaches a resource access control system. Within Majkut's disclosure it is taught how a user request is first received by a web server (enrollment system); see column 5, lines 25-29, Majkut. The web server then forwards the request to the database server (enrollment administration server); see column 5, lines 36-37, Majkut. Furthermore, Majkut also teaches rules applicable to groups of users; see column 20, lines 17-26, Majkut.

While Baker and Majkut both teach resource access control systems, neither explicitly cite the use of enrollment records, which are used to allow users to later access the resource. Also neither Baker nor Majuk explicitly

cite having the remote client access the resource as if the resource resides locally. In the same field of endeavor, Araujo also teaches a resource access control system. Within Araujo's disclosure it is taught how users are given profiles (enrollment record) which are used during resource access verifying and access establishment; see column 9, lines 7-56, Araujo. The profiles are used when reconnecting to a previous session; see at least column 46, line 65 – column 47, line 5, Araujo. Araujo also teaches how the accessed resource, which is a remote computer, seems as if it were directly there (as if it resides locally); see column 7, lines 58-62, Araujo.

Majkut teaches how the web server provides the user with a website interface by which to make the resource request; see column 5, lines 25-29, Majkut. In addition, Araujo teaches how a network enables a remote access session to seem like a direct (local) resource. Therefore it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art, during the time of the invention, to have combined the teachings of Baker with those of Majkut and Araujo, to provide a web-based resource request system.

2. With regards to claims 25 and 35, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method wherein remote access to the networked resource uses a remote display protocol (*Baker teaches the requesting of information from network resources, implying the network resources are network devices/computers; see column 3, lines 51-53, Baker. See also at least column 4, lines 53-56,*

Majkut. Also see column 7, line 63 – column 8, line 11, Araujo for AIP (a type of remote display protocol)).

3. With regards to claims 26 and 36, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method wherein identifying an enrollment rule further comprises: defining a plurality of groups of users; defining a plurality of groups of networked resources; and specifying a group of networked resources that a group of users is permitted to enroll (*see at least column 3, line 8, column 4, line 65 and column 5, line 11, Baker*).
4. With regards to claims 27 and 37, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method wherein enrolling the networked resource is disallowed from a remote console (*see column 4, lines 17-20, Baker*).
5. With regards to claims 28 and 38, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method wherein enrolling the networked resource requires the user to enroll from a console physically attached to the networked resource (*see column 3, lines 33-34, Baker*).
6. With regards to claims 29 ad 39, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method wherein granting access to the networked resource further comprises granting access to a desktop of a networked computing device

(see column 4, lines 11-15, Baker and see column 7, lines 58-62 of Araujo for support that a resource can be a remote computer).

7. With regards to claims 30 and 40, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method wherein the enrollment administration system is a network application *(see column 1, lines 54-56, Majkut)*.
8. With regards to claims 31 and 41, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method further comprising determining, by a locator system, a location of the user *(see at least column 6, lines 15-23, Majkut)*.
9. With regards to claims 32 and 42, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method further comprising enrolling the networked resource based on the location of the user *(see at least column 6, lines 15-23, Majkut)*.
10. With regards to claims 33 and 43, Baker teaches through Majkut and Araujo, the method further comprising denying access to the networked resources upon determining the user had not previously successfully enrolled the networked resource via the enrollment administration system *(see column 4, lines 30-34, Baker)*.

11. The obviousness motivation applied to independent claims 24 and 34 are applicable to their respective dependent claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The claims have been amended to highlight how a resource is a computer. The claims have also been amended to highlight the use of enrollment records, which are used to allow users to later access the resource. Finally the claims have been amended to highlight providing an environment wherein the accessed resource seemed as if the resource resides locally. A new search was conducted and the Araujo prior art was found. Araujo also teaches a resource access control system. Within Araujo's disclosure it is taught how users are given profiles (enrollment record) which are used during resource accessing; see column 9, lines 7-56, Araujo. The profiles are used when reconnecting to a previous session; see at least column 46, line 65 – column 47, line 5, Araujo. Araujo also teaches how the accessed resource, which is a remote computer, seems as if it were directly there (as if it resides locally); see column 7, lines 58-62, Araujo.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2453

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AZIZUL CHOUDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Krista Zele can be reached on (571) 272-7288. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2453

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. C./

Examiner, Art Unit 2453

/Krista M. Zele/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2453